

CALFRESH (CF) PROGRAM

REQUEST FOR POLICY/REGULATION INTERPRETATION

INSTRUCTIONS: Complete items 1 - 10 on the form. Use a separate form for each policy interpretation request. If additional space is needed, please use the second page. Be sure to identify the additional discussion with the appropriate number and heading. Retain a copy of the CF 24 for your records.

- Questions from counties, including county Quality Control, must be submitted by the county CalFresh Coordinator and may be submitted directly to the CalFresh Policy analyst assigned responsibility for the county, with a copy directed to the appropriate CalFresh Policy unit manager.
- Questions from Administrative Law Judges may be submitted directly to the CalFresh Policy analyst assigned responsibility to the county where the hearing took place, with a copy of the form directed to the appropriate CalFresh Bureau unit manager.

1. RESPONSE NEEDED DUE TO: <input type="checkbox"/> Policy/Regulation Interpretation <input type="checkbox"/> QC <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fair Hearing <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	5. DATE OF REQUEST: December 12, 2012	NEED RESPONSE BY: January 7, 2013
2. REQUESTOR NAME:	6. COUNTY/ORGANIZATION: Mendocino	
3. PHONE NO.:	7. SUBJECT: Property Limits and overissuance	
4. REGULATION CITE(S): MPP 42-207; 42-201; 42-203.3; 42-205.2; 63-501.21	8. REFERENCES: <i>(Include ACL/ACIN, court cases, etc. in references)</i> NOTE: All requests must have a regulation cite(s) and/or a reference(s). (Dannenberg v. O'Connor, 195 CA 2d 194);(Hibberd v. Smith, 67 Cal. 547);(Reina v. Erassarret, 90 Cal. App. 2d 418);(Henneberry v. Henneberry, 164 CA 2d 125)	
9. QUESTION: (INCLUDE SCENARIO IF NEEDED FOR CLARITY):		

Is the claimant's interest in the real property mentioned in the attached proposed decision accessible?

The claimant indicates she did not know she had an interest in real property and the claimant's mother said she only put the claimant on the property deed to get insurance. The county indicates the claimant has an interest in the property that should be counted toward the property limit for the CalFresh program. The claimant's lawyer argues that the claimant does not have an interest since she did not accept the transfer, but in the alternative, if it is determined she has an interest then the lawyer argues the property is not accessible.

10. REQUESTOR'S PROPOSED ANSWER:

See proposed decision.

11. STATE POLICY RESPONSE (CFPB USE ONLY):

The CalFresh Policy Bureau concurs with the proposed decision.

FOR CDSS USE

DATE RECEIVED:

December 12, 2012

DATE RESPONDED TO COUNTY/ALJ:

January 2, 2013